

Applicant : Heidi Picher-Dempsey  
Serial No. : 08/990,096  
Filed : December 12, 1997  
Page : 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 12128-027001

### REMARKS

In the final action dated May 22, 2000, the examiner rejected claims 1-15 based on Crawley and Chang. Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 11, 17 and 18 to make clear that "the server has a location independent of the path" from the originating router to the destination router.

The examiner construes Crawley's destination router as the server of Applicant's claim 1. However, Applicant's server has a location independent of the communication path, and is therefore a separate entity from "premises routers" (i.e., originating or destination routers) (page 6) of the communication path. There is nothing in Crawley that teaches or suggests a server as disclosed in the amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinct from Crawley.


Chang likewise does not teach nor suggest a server having a location independent of the communication path. Applicant's claim 1 is thus patentably distinct from Crawley and Chang.

Accordingly, claims 6, 11, 17, and 18, being the method, system, and computer program claims of claim 1, are allowable for at least the reasons discussed in conjunction with claim 1.

A check in payment of the excess claims fees required by the above amendments and petition for automatic extension is included. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/21/00



David L. Feigenbaum  
Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906